

Application Serial No. 10/662,034

Attorney Docket No. 200309970-1

REMARKS/ARGUMENTSClaim Status

Claims 1-14, 16-18, 20-21, 28-30, 33-34, 38, and 40-44 are pending in this application. Claim 17 stands objected to. Claims 1-14, 16-18, 20-21, 28-30, 33, 34, 38, and 40-44 stand rejected.

Claims 12 and 42 have been amended. Claims 14, 16-18, 20-21, and 33-34 have been canceled.

Claim Objections

The objection to claim 17 is now moot in light of the cancellation of claim 17. Applicant therefore requests that the objection to claim 17 be withdrawn.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 12 and 42 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112(1) as failing to comply with the written description requirement. Claims 12 and 42 have been amended to overcome this rejection. Applicant therefore requests that the rejection of claims 12 and 42 under 35 U.S.C. § 112(1) be withdrawn.

Application Serial No. 10/662,034

Attorney Docket No. 200309970-1

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 102

The rejection of claims 33 and 34 as being anticipated by Trang (U.S. Pat. No. 5,630,054) is moot in light of the cancellation of claims 33-34.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-4 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Liu et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,182,180) in view of Elliot (U.S. Pat. App. Pub. No. 205/0055489). With respect to claim 1, the Office Action asserts that Liu discloses all elements of the claim except for "a first first-in-first-out (FIFO) buffer . . . coupled between the host processor and the business controller over an internal bus, the first FIFO not being coupled to the send machine over the internal bus." The Office Action asserts that this limitation is provided by Elliot.

Claim 1 has been amended to clarify that the communications bus is a system bus. Support for this limitation may be found, for example, at p. 10, lines 12-15, which states that the communications bus 202 is also referred to as a "system bus."

Claim 1 has further been amended to clarify that the first FIFO is not coupled between the host processor and the bus controller over the system bus. Support for this limitation may be found, for example, in FIG. 2A, which shows the FIFO 214 coupled between the

Application Serial No. 10/662,034

Attorney Docket No. 200309970-1

host processor 238 and the bus controller 208 over the internal buses 252 and 216, but not over the system bus 202.

Elliot clearly teaches that the bus 40 is a system bus, not an internal bus. Bus 40 is clearly labeled as a "system bus" in, for example, FIG. 1. Elliot, therefore, does not disclose the limitation of claim 1, as amended, that "the first FIFO [is] further coupled between the host processor and the bus controller over an internal bus but not over the system bus."

Neither Liu nor Elliot, either alone or in combination, teaches or suggests this limitation of claim 1, as amended. Claim 1, as amended, therefore, patentably distinguishes over the combination of Liu and Elliot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the rejection of claim 1 over the combination of Liu and Elliot be withdrawn. Claims 2-4 depend from claim 1 and therefore patentably distinguish over the combination of Liu and Elliot for at least the same reason.

Claims 5-11 stand rejected over the combination of Liu, Elliot, and various other references. None of these references, either alone or in combination, teaches or suggests the above-referenced limitation of claim 1. Claims 5-11 depend, either directly or indirectly, on claim 1. Claims 5-11, therefore, patentably distinguish over the cited combinations for at least the reason provided above with respect to claim 1.

Application Serial No. 10/662,034

Attorney Docket No. 200309970-1

Independent claim 12, as amended, includes the same relevant limitations as claim 1, and therefore patentably distinguishes over the combination of Johnson (U.S. Pat. No. 6,122,758) and Elliot for at least the same reasons provided above with respect to claim 1.

The Johnson patent has the same assignee as the Liu patent and includes the same relevant disclosure. Neither Johnson nor Elliot, therefore, either individually or in combination, teaches or suggests "the first FIFO further coupled between the host processor and the bus controller over a first internal bus but not over the system bus," as recited by claim 12 as amended. Claim 12 as amended therefore patentably distinguishes over the combination of Johnson and Elliot.

Claim 13 stands rejected over the combination of Elliot, Feeney, Cao, and Webb. Claim 13 depends from claim 12 and therefore includes all of the limitations of claim 12. None of the cited references, either alone or in combination, teaches or suggests the relevant limitation of claim 12 discussed above. Claim 13, therefore, patentably distinguishes over the cited combination.

The rejection of claims 14, 16, and 17 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Regis (EP 1 174 798 A2) in view of Davidson et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 5,613,157) and Quicksall (U.S. Pat. No. 6,449,289) is now moot in light of the cancellation of claims 14, 16, and 17.

Application Serial No. 10/662,034

Attorney Docket No. 200309970-1

The rejection of claims 18, 20, and 21 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Regis in view of Davidson and Quicksall is now moot in light of the cancellation of claims 18, 20, and 21.

The rejection of claims 28-30 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Regis in view of Davidson and Quicksall is now moot in light of the cancellation of claims 28-30.

The rejection of claims 38, 40, and 41 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Liu et al. in view of Cao et al. and Huges et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,266,744) is moot in light of the cancellation of claims 38, 40, and 41.

Claim 42 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Johnson in view of Elliot, Feeney, Cao, and Webb. Claim 42 as amended, however, includes the same relevant limitation as claim 1, namely "the first FIFO further coupled between the host processor and the bus controller over an internal bus but not over the system bus." None of the cited references, either individually or in combination, teaches or suggests this limitation. Claim 42, as amended, therefore patentably distinguishes over the cited combination.

Claim 44 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Johnson in view of Elliot. Claim 43 as amended, however, includes the same relevant limitation as claim 1, namely "the first FIFO further coupled between the host processor and the

Application Serial No. 10/662,034

Attorney Docket No. 200309970-1

bus controller over an internal bus but not over the system bus." None of the cited references, either individually or in combination, teaches or suggests this limitation. Claim 43, as amended, therefore patentably distinguishes over the cited combination.

Claim 44 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Johnson in view of Elliot and Cao. Claim 44 as amended, however, includes the same relevant limitation as claim 1, namely "the first FIFO further coupled between the host processor and the bus controller over an internal bus but not over the system bus." None of the cited references, either individually or in combination, teaches or suggests this limitation. Claim 44, as amended, therefore patentably distinguishes over the cited combination.

Best Available Copy

Application Serial No. 10/662,034

Attorney Docket No. 200309970-1

CONCLUSIONS

Any dependent claims not specifically referenced above incorporate the limitations of the independent claims from which they depend, and therefore are patentable for at least the same reasons.

If the Examiner considers the arguments presented herein not to be persuasive, the Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner contact the Applicant to schedule an interview at a mutually convenient time.

If this response is not considered timely filed and if a request for extension of time is otherwise absent, applicant hereby requests any extension of time. Please charge any fees or make any credits, to Deposit Account No. 08-2025.

Respectfully submitted,



Robert Plotkin, Esq.

Reg. No. 43,861

10/19/2006
Date

Robert Plotkin, P.C.
91 Main Street, Suite 204
Concord, MA 01742-2527
Tel: (978) 318-9914
Fax: (978) 318-9060